



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,883	04/01/2005	Jung-Ho Han	DUW-0010	5684
34610	7590	12/12/2007		
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			EXAMINER BASIT, ABDUL	
			ART UNIT 3694	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/529,883	Applicant(s) HAN, JUNG-HO	
	Examiner Abdul Basit	Art Unit 3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/1/2005</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> |
|---|--|

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because for several informalities: This includes the phrase, "comprising step," which is improper grammar. Also, claim 1 includes several instances of the phrase "account work." It is recommended that this be changed to accounting, which is the focus of the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Regarding claim 8, the phrase "etc." renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagimachi (US Pub. No. 2002/0059090) in view of Skinner (US Pat. No. 5,696,702) in further view of Choban (US Pub. No. 2002/0194100) and in further view of Waldspurger (US Pat. No. 7,260,820).

Regarding claim 1:

Yanagimachi teaches a method for processing an account information using a network,
(see ¶ 26-33 – *indicates a method that includes a job administration system that suggests these elements*).

Skinner, not Yanagimachi, teaches verifying in which a customer or part time worker is verified in such a manner that a customer information or part time worker information registered and stored in the database is compared with a customer or part time worker information inputted when a customer or part time worker is connected with the website;
(see column 5, lines 26-44 – *verification is inherent to information relating to employee work product which is sent via remote access*)

Waldspurger, not Yanagimachi, teaches storing evidence document image information;
(see column 3, lines 20-25 - *teaches storing document images*)

Skinner, not Yanagimachi, teaches listing work in which a user is connected with the website and requests an assignment of work listed on the website; (see column 5, lines 26-44)

Skinner, not Yanagimachi, teaches selecting an part time worker in which the part time worker is selected for distributing the customer's account work listed on the website;
(see column 5, lines 26-44)

Skinner, not Yanagimachi, teaches Storing an part time worker's account information
(see column 5, lines 26-44 – *teaches info of a worker*), and Choban, not Yanagimachi, teaches one client's terminal being connected to an outside party's server. (see abstract – *reviewers who are third parties having access to a user's information*)

Waldspurger, not Yanagimachi, teaches converts the evidence document image information into an account information. *(see column 3, lines 20-25 - teaches converting image information into textual information)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Skinner, Choban and Waldspurger. Motivation to modify with Skinner exists because the various elements of verification, providing a list of work, and storing a worker's information enhance an administration system that can be used for telecommuting. Motivation to modify with Choban exists because allowing a outside party to view a worker's information can help to reduce errors. Motivation to modify with Waldspurger allows for an efficient method of retrieving information from a document image.

Regarding claim 2:

Waldspurger, not Yanagimachi, teaches the step in which the evidence document image information stored in the customer server is converted into an evidence document text information by an evidence document recognition program; *(see column 3, lines 20-25 - teaches converting image information into textual information)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Yanagimachi with Waldspurger. Motivation to modify with Waldspurger allows for an efficient method of retrieving information from a document image.

Regarding claim 3:

Yanagimachi further teaches that for the method of claim 1 wherein said the step for

verifying customer includes the step for providing a customer identification (ID) number in which the central server generates a customer ID number and provides to the customer for preventing a revealing of the customer information. (see ¶ 73-74)

Regarding claim 4:

Choban, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 1 further comprising the step for reviewing an account information in which the customer reviews the account information stored by the part time worker using the account process program. (see *abstract and ¶ 23 – reviewers who are third parties having access to a user's information*)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Choban. Motivation to modify with Choban exists because allowing a outside party to view a worker's information can help to reduce errors.

Regarding claim 5:

Choban, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 4, further comprising the step for correcting an account information (see *abstract and ¶ 23 – reviewers who are third parties having access to a user's information*)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Choban. Motivation to modify with Choban exists because allowing a outside party to view a worker's information can help to reduce errors.

Regarding claim 6:

Choban, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 5, further comprising the step for re-listing an account work in which as a result of the review of the account

information review step, when there is an error in the account information stored by the part time worker, the customer lists the account work as a new account work on the website. *(see abstract and ¶ 23 – reviewers who are third parties having access to a user's information).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Choban. Motivation to modify with Choban exists because allowing a outside party to view a worker's information can help to reduce errors.

Regarding claim 7:

Skinner, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 4, further comprising the step for an electronic payment in which the central server that receives a completion of the account work from the customer server requests a cost payment to the customer server through the network, so that the cost payment is performed. *(see column 5, lines 26-42 - payment inherent to amount billable and costs).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Skinner. Motivation to modify with Skinner exists because electronic payment allows for a telecommuting system to work more efficiently.

Regarding claim 8:

Skinner, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 7, further comprising the step for determining an part time worker level in which the central server determines an part time worker's level based on an information concerning an part time worker's account work process performance, an account knowledge state, etc. *(see column 5, lines 39-42 – document study/activity time which suggests evaluating worker level)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Skinner. Motivation to modify with Skinner exists because determining work level evaluation allows for a telecommuting system to work more efficiently.

Regarding claim 10:

Choban, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 1 there is a list a plurality of evidence document image information stored in the customer server into an evidence document text information using the account process program for thereby generating one file (*see abstract – a portfolio includes more than one piece of information/file*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Choban. Motivation to modify with Choban exists because a portfolio is an efficient method of analyzing multiple pieces of information.

Regarding claim 13:

Waldspurger, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 1 wherein said the step for converting the evidence document image information into an evidence document text information; further comprising the steps for:

recognizing the positions of items such as date, company name, money amount, applications, etc. needed for the account work; (*see column 3, lines 12-26*)

recognizing form lines and text portions in the above position; (*see column 3, lines 12-26*)

recognizing the text portions and a background portion; (*see column 3, lines 12-26*)

thinning by expressing the text portions formed of a thick line into a single line representing the shape; (*see column 3, lines 12-26*) and analyzing the motion and shape of the single line and reading the text. (*see column 3, lines 12-26*)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Yanagimachi with Waldspurger. Motivation to modify with Waldspurger allows for an efficient method of retrieving information from a document image.

6. Claim 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagimachi (US Pub. No. 2002/0059090) in view of Skinner (US Pat. No. 5,696,702) in further view of Choban (US Pub. No. 2002/0194100) in further view of Waldspurger (US Pat. No. 7,260,820) and in further view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 9:

Official notice is given that evidence document image information is a digital image file produced in such a manner that a tax bill, credit card receipt, temporarily tax bill, cash register receipt, etc. which are needed for a common account process are scanned using a scanner or are photographed using a digital camera.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Official Notice. Motivation to modify exists because scanned information is an efficient means of obtaining an image.

Regarding claim 11:

Official notice is given that accounting information exists in journal form. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with Official Notice. Motivation to modify exists because the journal method is an established system of viewing accounting information.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagimachi (US Pub. No. 2002/0059090) in view of Skinner (US Pat. No. 5,696,702) in further view of Choban (US Pub. No. 2002/0194100) in further view of Waldspurger (US Pat. No. 7,260,820) and in further view of George (US Pat. No. 5,978,648)

Regarding claim 12:

George, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 1, said account process program provides an account work screen on the part time worker terminal, and said work screen includes an evidence document image information region, an evidence document text information correcting region, an evidence document text information list, and an account process region. *(see figures 1-4 and figure 14 – showing how a work screen can include these items).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yanagimachi with George. Motivation to modify exists because a work screen that organizes information is an efficient means of viewing data.

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagimachi (US Pub. No. 2002/0059090) in view of Skinner (US Pat. No. 5,696,702) in further view of Choban (US Pub. No. 2002/0194100) in further view of Waldspurger (US Pat. No. 7,260,820) and in further view of Musafia (US Pub. No. 2002/0038235)

Regarding claim 14:

Musafia, not Yanagimachi, teaches that for the method of claim 1 wherein said step for selecting the part time worker, a customer's desired account work completion time and the amount of the account work are compared with the part time worker's account work processing possible time and work time for thereby selecting an part time worker who can do the account work. (see ¶ 14-15 – *determining worker efficiency*)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Yanagimachi with Musafia. Motivation to modify exists because determining worker efficiency helps to reduce costs.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. This includes US Pub. No. 2002/0111824, and information available on the USPTO regarding various tools implemented by the USPTO that allows Patent Examiners to use data and methods of telecommuting. An example has been enclosed regarding document data which is used in this application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdul Basit whose telephone number is 571 272-7246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571 272 6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/529,883
Art Unit: 3694

Page 11

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

aqb



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600